

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 300

PS 002 002

By-Aspy, David N.
The Effect of Teachers' Inferred Self Concept Upon Student Achievement.
Florida Univ., Gainesville.
Pub Date [69]
Note-20p.
EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.10

Descriptors-Elementary School Teachers, *Self Concept, *Student Improvement, *Teacher Characteristics,
Teacher Evaluation, *Teacher Influence, Teacher Rating
Identifiers-Stanford Achievement Test, Tylers Ideal Real Self Q Sort

A study was conducted to determine if students with teachers of high self-concepts achieved greater gains than students with teachers of low self-concepts. Six third-grade teachers were observed one hour in September and another hour in March during a reading lesson, by three raters who completed a checklist designed to assess self-concept. Twenty students from each class were selected by IQ and sex. Five subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test were administered as pretests and posttests. A positive relationship between teacher self-concept and student achievement gains was observed on subtests of paragraph meaning, language, word meaning, and word study skills, and was statistically significant at or above the .05 level. On the spelling subtest, teacher self-concept was related negatively to the test score gains, but the relationship was not statistically significant at or above the .05 level. On the spelling subtest, teacher self-concept was related negatively to the test score gains, but the relationship was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Further studies should be conducted. References and behavior rating scales are included. (JS)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

The Effect of Teachers' Inferred Self Concept

Upon Student Achievement

David N. Aspy

University of Florida

There is extensive evidence to support the contention that a student's self concept influences his performance in the classroom. Reeder (1955) found that children achieve lower in terms of their potential if they have a low self concept. Coopersmith (1961) reported that a low self concept is associated with high achievement when high achievement need is present. Campbell (1965) reported that for fourth, fifth and sixth grade students there is a positive relationship between performance on Coopersmith's Scale for Self Esteem and Achievement scores. As Campbell (1967) concludes from the literature, "This variety of methods and of studies tends to support a low direct relationship between self concept and achievement." That is, the general tendency is for a low self concept to be associated with lowered performance.

A second aspect of the issue of the self concept in the classroom is that the teacher influences the students' self concept. Combs (1965) states that a "positive view of self" is one of the characteristics of an effective teacher. McCallon (1966) found that the more favorably a teacher perceived a student considered least-desirable-to-teach the greater was that student's reduction in his discrepancy between his real and ideal self. Davidson and Lang (1960) reported that "children's perceptions of their teacher's feelings toward them

correlated positively and significantly with their self perceptions."

If the self concept tends to be positively related to students' performances and if the teacher influences the students' self perceptions, a logical extension of these positions is that the teacher's behavior affects student performance, including academic achievement. One of the central tenets of self concept theory is that a person's behavior is a function of his self concept at a given point in time. Therefore, within this system, the teacher's behavior which influences the students' self perceptions is a function of her self perception and should be related to student achievement. An investigation of the relationship of the teacher's self concept to student achievement is a significant and relatively unexplored area.

The relationship of teacher self concept to student performance is especially important in light of an accumulating body of research pertaining to teacher self concept. Smith (1965) concluded that "it is the older, more experienced teacher who views the teacher's role as that of one who is seen and not heard." Aspy (1968) using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale found that the mean total score for sixty-four secondary teachers was below the twenty-fifth percentile. certainly, the conclusion drawn by Combs (1965), "good teachers feel basically adequate rather than inadequate," supports the contention that a teacher's self perception is of central concern.

This study investigated the relationship between (1) the teacher's self concept and (2) the students' academic achievement.

Methodology

Teachers. Six third grade teachers were observed for one hour in their classrooms by three trained raters who completed a checklist designed to assess self concept. The raters observed each teacher during one hour in September and one hour in March and completed the checklist after each of the visits.

Self Concept Ratings. Two procedures were employed in the measurement of self perception. First, during September each teacher completed the Fiedler's Q-Sort procedure as modified for teachers by Tyler (1964, Appendix B). This procedure yields an ideal-real self correlation for each teacher and the results are presented in Table I below:

Table I	
Teacher	r
I	.85
II	.84
III	.79
IV	.64
V	.61
VI	.58

Correlations for Tyler's Odeal-Real Self Q-Sort

A second measure of self perception was obtained through a procedure for obtaining the inferred self concept suggested by Parker (1966). The general procedure is that of inferring a person's self concept from his observed behavior. For this study the raters were three advanced graduate students majoring in human growth and development in a college of education. Each of the raters observed each of the six teachers during one hour of reading instruction in Sep-

tember and again in March. The raters completed the self concept checklist independently (Appendix A) after each visit. The ratings are presented in Table II.

Table II

	September			"	March			Indiv Mean	Group Mean
	Rater A	Rater B	Rater C		Rater A	Rater B	Rater C		
Teacher I	125	130	127		124	127	129	125	
Teacher II	124	119	115		126	123	122	122	122
Teacher III	119	120	116		117	117	119	118	
Teacher IV	105	98	101		101	95	96	99	
Teacher V	91	95	92		89	92	91	92	93
Teacher VI	89	87	87		90	89	85	88	

Ratings for Inferred Self Concept of Teachers

Note: Scale range is 150 to 30 with higher scores representing more positive self perceptions.

Since the results of both Q-sort and the inferred self concept ratings were in the same rank order and yielded significant differences (.01) between the three highest and the three lowest scores. Teachers I, II and III were combined into a self concept group while teachers IV, V, and VI were combined into low self concept group.

Subjects. The subjects were selected from the teachers' classes and included (1) the five boys with the highest IQ's, (2) the five boys with the lowest IQ's, (3) the five girls with the highest IQ's, and (4) the five girls with the lowest IQ's. Thus, twenty students were selected from each teacher's class. The differences between the mean IQ's for each of the low groups were non-significant, and the same was true for the high groups. Of course, there were significant

differences between the high and low groups. The selection process controlled for sex and IQ.

The students were administered five subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test during September and again during May of the same academic year. The differences between the subjects' scores were used as the measure of the students' academic gain or loss. The subtests were (1) Word Meaning, (2) Paragraph Meaning, (3) Spelling, (4) Word Study Skills, and (5) Language, all of which relate to verbal quantities. This seemed appropriate since the teachers were rated while working with reading groups.

The achievement test results are summarized in Tables III_VIII.

Table III

MEAN SCORE FOR PARAGRAPH MEANING FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teachers	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	1.68	.66	.76	.40	.88	High
2	1.22	.32	1.44	1.32	1.08	High
3	1.12	.44	1.44	1.00	1.00	High
4	1.10	.74	.80	.68	.83	Low
5	.58	.22	.40	.28	.37	Low
6	1.02	.74	.76	.64	.79	Low
Average for IQ Groups	1.12	.52	.93	.72	Average for Entire Group	.82

¹The test norms indicate that the gain by the average third grade student is 1.0 years.

PS 002002

Table IV

MEAN SCORE FOR LANGUAGE FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teacher	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	2.04	.78	1.16	.44	1.11	High
2	2.30	.90	2.88	1.78	1.97	High
3	1.70	1.24	1.26	1.12	1.33	High
4	.70	.58	1.18	.92	.85	Low
5	1.04	.42	.84	.18	.62	Low
6	.00	.40	1.36	.74	.62	Low
Average for IQ Groups	1.30	.72	1.45	.86	Average for Entire Group	1.08

¹The test norms indicate that the gain by the average third grade student is 1.0 years.

Table V

MEAN SCORE FOR WORD MEANING FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teacher	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	1.44	.98	.76	.82	1.00	High
2	1.44	.82	.86	1.32	1.11	High
3	1.30	.58	.66	.60	.79	High
4	1.28	.30	.90	.70	.80	Low
5	1.28	.20	.76	.72	.74	Low
6	.62	.70	1.06	.60	.75	Low
Average for IQ Groups	1.23	.60	.83	.79	Average for Entire Group	.86

¹The test norms indicate that the gain by the average third grade student is 1.0 years.

Table VI

MEAN SCORE FOR WORD STUDY SKILLS FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teacher	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	1.78	1.74	1.94	.74	1.55	High
2	2.00	.08	2.24	2.44	1.69	High
3	.16	.82	.98	.18	.46	High
4	.88	1.02	.78	.76	.86	Low
5	1.36	.80	.44	.12	.62	Low
6	1.50	.08	.72	.96	.82	Low
Average for IQ Groups	1.23	.76	1.18	.83	Average for Entire Group	1.00

¹The test norms indicate that the gain by the average third grade student is 1.0 years.

Table VII

MEAN SCORE FOR SPELLING FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teacher	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	1.00	.92	1.08	.50	.87	High
2	1.42	.18	1.22	1.68	1.12	High
3	.52	1.30	.78	.74	.83	High
4	.94	1.14	1.80	1.26	1.28	Low
5	1.38	.66	1.24	.58	.96	Low
6	.92	.88	1.22	1.22	1.06	Low
Average for IQ Groups	1.03	.84	1.22	.99	Average for Entire Group	1.02

¹The test norms indicate that the gain by the average third grade student is 1.0 years.

Table VIII
MEAN SCORE FOR TOTAL FOR EACH GROUP¹

Teacher	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Average by Teachers	Levels of Self Concept
	High IQ	Low IQ	High IQ	Low IQ		
1	8.54	5.22	5.76	2.96	5.62	High
2	8.38	2.50	8.64	8.54	7.01	High
3	4.48	4.34	5.20	3.50	4.38	High
4	4.50	3.78	5.46	4.32	4.51	Low
5	5.94	2.74	3.68	1.68	3.51	Low
6	3.96	2.88	5.12	4.16	4.03	Low
Average for IQ Groups	5.96	2.57	5.64	4.19	Average for Entire Group	4.84

¹The test norms indicate that the total gain for five subtests by the average third grade student is 5.0 years.

As can be observed, in Paragraph Meaning, Language, Word Meaning, and Word Study Skills the average amount gained by the students of the high self concept teachers was substantially more than the students of those teachers having lower self concepts, while on Spelling the differences are negative but minimal. Overall, on the total gain, the students of high self concept teachers demonstrated greater gain than those of low self concept teachers. An analysis of variance for each of the subtests yielded the results summarized in Table IX.

Table IX

A SUMMARY OF THE STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOURCES OF VARIANCE

Source	Total Gain	Paragraph Meaning	Language	Word Meaning	Word	
					Study Skills	Spelling
1. IQ	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
2. Level of self concept	.01	.01	.001	.05	.01	N.S.
3. Sex	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
4. IQ and self concept	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
5. IQ and sex	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	.01	N.S.	N.S.
6. Self concept and sex	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
7. IQ, self concept and sex	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
8. Teachers within levels of self concept	.01	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	.01	N.S.
9. Teachers and sex within levels of self concept	.01	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
10. Teachers and IQ within levels of self concept	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
11. Teachers, sex and IQ within levels of self concept	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

N.S. = Non significant

Summary and Conclusions

The levels of self concept of teachers related positively to the cognitive growth of their students. This positive relationship was found for four subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test and the total gain. These relationships were statistically significant at or above the .05 level of confidence. For the Spelling subtest teacher self concept was related negatively to the test score gains, but the relationship was not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

This study supports the general hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the levels of teacher self concept and the cognitive growth of the students. In particular, it points up the need for assessing teachers on other than intellectual indices. However, while assessments were made independent of teacher knowledge ability, it is also quite possible that those having the highest levels of self concept were most knowledgeable, and future studies should incorporate such necessary controls. In addition, there are further questions which must be asked. Is, for example, the level of self concept of the teacher more critical during the student's early grammar school years than in later phases of education? In any event, this project can serve as a model for further research into the effectiveness of teaching, and, if replicated, the results of this study have potentially profound implications for teacher-training programs.

References

- Bledsoe, J. C. "Self Concepts of Children and Their Intelligence, Achievement, Interests, and Anxiety." Childhood Education, Vol 43 (March, 1967), pp. 436.
- Boyd, Harry S. and Sisney, Vernon. "Immediate Self Image Confrontation and Change in Self Concept." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol 31, (1967), pp. 291-294.
- Brehn, Mary and Baek, Kenneth. "Self Image and Attitude Toward Drugs." Journal of Personality, Vol 36, (1968), pp. 299-314.
- Butler, Robert n. "Aspects of Survival and Adaptation in Human Aging." American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol 123, (1967), pp. 1233-1243.
- Campbell, P. B. "School and Self Concept." Educational Leadership, Vol 24, (March, 1967), pp. 510-513.
- Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers: A Percept-View of Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Coopersmith, Stanley, Beardslee, Betty J., and Lowy, David C. "The Antecedents and Dynamics of Self Esteem, M-2696." Progress report covering the period January 1, 1959 to December 31, 1961, submitted May 15, 1961. Unpublished report of a study under a grant from the United States Public Health Service.
- Davidson, H. B. and Lang, G. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement, and Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, Vol 29, No 2, (December, 1960), pp 107-118.
- Dyson, E. "Study of Ability Grouping and the Self Concept." Journal of Educational Research, Vol 60, (May, 1967), pp 403-405.
- Frank, G. H. and Hiester D. S. "Reliability of the Ideal-Self Concept." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol 14, (July, 1967), pp 356-357.
- Haas, H. I. and Maehr, M. L. "Two Experiments on the Concept of Self and the Reaction of Others." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 1, (1965), pp 100-105.
- Jones, J. G. and Strowig, R. W. "Adolescent Identity and Self Perception as Predictors of Scholastic Achievement: Who Am I? Technique." Journal of Educational Research, Vol 62, (October, 1968), pp 78-82.
- Korman, A. K. "Revelance of Personal Need Satisfaction for Overall Satisfaction as a Function of Self Esteem." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 51, (December, 1967), pp 533-538.

- Kowitz, G. T. "Test Anxiety and Self Concept." Childhood Education, Vol 44, (November, 1967), pp 162-164.
- Lynch, S. "Intense Human Experience: Its Relationship to Openness and Self Concept." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.
- Ludwig, D. J. and Maehr, M. L. "Changes in Self Concept and Stated Behavioral Preferences," Child Development, Vol 38, (June, 1967), pp 453-467.
- Maehr, M. L. and Mensing, J. "Concept of Self and the Reactions of Others." Sociometry, Vol 25, (1962), pp 353-357.
- Mehrens, W. A. "Self Concepts of Graduate Students." Journal of Educational Research, Vol 61, (November, 1967), pp 112-113.
- McCallon, E. L. "Self-Ideal Discrepancy and Correlates Sex and Academic Achievement," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol 35, (Summer, 1967), pp 45-49.
- McClelland, David C. and Watt, Normal R. "Sex Role Alienation in Schizophrenia." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, Vol 73, (1968), pp 226-239.
- Nesbitt, Richard and Gordon, A. "Self Esteem and Susceptibility to Social Influence." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 5, (1967), pp 268-276.
- Olavarri, Martin. "Some Relationships of Ability Grouping to Student Self Concept." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1967.
- Parker, James. "The Relationship of Self Report to Inferred Self Concept." Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol 26, (1966), pp 691-700.
- Prows, Nancy. "An Attempt to Increase Reading Achievement by Organizing Instruction and Sensitizing the Teacher to Building Positive Self Concepts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967.
- Rabinowitz, Morris. "The Relationship of Self Regard to the Effectiveness of Life Experiences." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol 13, (1966), pp 139.
- Reeder, Thelma. "A Study of Some Relationships Between Level of Self Concept, Academic Achievement and Classroom Adjustment." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, 1955.
- Schuldt, W. J. and Truax, C. B. "Client Awareness of Adjustment in Self and Ideal Self Concepts." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol 15, (March, 1968), pp 158-159.

- Secord, P. F., Backman C. W. and Eachus, H. T. "Effects of Imbalance in the Self Concept on the Perception of Persons." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol 68, (1964), pp 443-446.
- Smith, T. E. "The Image of High School Teachers: Self and Other, Real and Ideal (Should Teachers Be Seen and Not Heard?)" Journal of Educational Reserach, Vol 59, (November, 1965), pp 99-104.
- Soares, A. T. "Self Perception of Student Teachers and the Meaningfulness of Their Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol 19, (Summer, 1968), pp 187-191.
- Tyler, Louise L. "The Concept of an Ideal Teacher-Student Relationship." Journal of Educational Research, Vol 58, (November, 1964), pp 112-117.
- Videbeck, Richard. "Self Conception and the Reaction of Others." Sociometry, Vol 23, (1969), pp 351-359.
- Walberg, H. "Effects of Tutoring and Practice Teaching on Self Concept and Attitude in Education Students." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol 19, (Fall, 1968), 283-291.
- Walberg, H. "Structure of Self Concepts in Prospective Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, Vol 61, (October, 1967), pp. 84-86.
- Williams, R. L. and Cole, S. "Self Concept and School Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol 46, (January, 1968), pp 478-481.

APPENDIX

Item 5

Parker - Adjective Check List

DATE _____

STUDENT'S NAME _____

SITUATION _____

TEACHER'S NAME _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is a test to see how a person describes himself. Read each sentence carefully. Rate each sentence according to the way it best fits you as a person. There are five ways you can rate the sentence. Each of the five ways is described by a number. Circle the number that best describes how the sentence fits you. Be sure to complete the ratings for each sentence.

- | | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| 1. I'm good in school work. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not good in school work. |
| 2. Mostly I have good ideas. | 1 2 3 4 5 | My ideas are poor. |
| 3. I'm a worthwhile person. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not a worthwhile person. |
| 4. I'm pretty strong. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too strong. |
| 5. Most people trust me. | 1 2 3 4 5 | Most people don't trust me. |
| 6. Teachers like me pretty well. | 1 2 3 4 5 | Teachers don't like me too much. |
| 7. I can do most things well. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I do very few things well. |
| 8. I'm a happy person. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm an unhappy person. |
| 9. I'm healthy. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too healthy. |
| 10. I'm popular. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too popular. |
| 11. I'm a good reader. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not a good reader. |
| 12. I'm a hard worker. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not a good worker. |
| 13. I'm very shy. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not shy. |
| 14. I don't get tired quickly. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I get tired quickly. |
| 15. Other people find me interesting. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too interesting to others. |
| 16. I work well with others in school. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I don't work well with others in school. |
| 17. I'm pretty brave. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not brave. |

Item 5

-2-

- | | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| 18. I'm pretty smart. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not very smart. |
| 19. I'm not tall enough. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm tall enough. |
| 20. Most people are fair with me. | 1 2 3 4 5 | Most people are unfair with me. |
| 21. I don't do well in class discussion. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I do well in class discussion. |
| 22. I handle most of my problems well. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I can't handle my problems very well. |
| 23. I'm a helpful person. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too helpful. |
| 24. I'm good looking | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too good looking. |
| 25. Most people are hard for me to get along with. | 1 2 3 4 5 | Most people are easy for me to get along with. |
| 26. I'm mostly happy in class. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm mostly unhappy in class. |
| 27. I can usually finish what I start. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I never finish most things. |
| 28. I'm proud of me. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm not too proud of me. |
| 29. I handle my body well in sports and games. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I don't handle my body well in sports and games. |
| 30. I'm not often sorry for others. | 1 2 3 4 5 | I'm often sorry for others. |

Appendix B

Fiedler's Q-Sort as Modified by Tyler

1. The teacher cannot explain things so that a student understands.
2. The teacher feels disgusted by the student.
3. The teacher treats the student like an honored guest.
4. The teacher often flounders around before getting the student's meaning.
5. The teacher is somewhat cool toward the student.
6. The teacher is hesitant about asking questions of the student.
7. The teacher reacts with some understanding of the student's ideas.
8. The teacher is interested but unemotionally involved.
9. The teacher sees the student as a co-worker on a common problem.
10. The teacher is usually able to understand what the student is saying.
11. The teacher likes the student.
12. The teacher is overprotective of the student.
13. The teacher's comments are always right in line with what the student is attempting to convey.
14. The teacher responds warmly to the student's ideas.
15. The teacher talks down to the student.
16. The teacher shows no comprehension of the ideas the student is trying to communicate.
17. The teacher is hostile toward the student.
18. The teacher tries to sell herself.
19. The teacher often misses the point the student is trying to get across.
20. The teacher at times draws emotionally away from the student.
21. The teacher readily accedes to the student's requests.
22. The teacher is able to keep up with the student's ideas much of the time.

23. The teacher's feelings do not seem to be aroused by student's remarks.
24. The teacher gives and takes in the classroom situation.
25. The teacher really tries to explain ideas clearly to the student.
26. The teacher is pleasant to the student.
27. The teacher readily dismisses the students ideas.
28. The teacher is able to understand completely what is being communicated.
29. The teacher showers the student with affection and sympathy.
30. The teacher sets in a very superior manner toward the student.
31. The teacher somehow seems to miss the student's meaning time and again.
32. The teacher rejects the student.
33. The teacher frequently apologizes when making a suggestion to the student.
34. The teacher is unable to understand the student on any but a purely superficial level.
35. The teacher occasionally makes the student angry.
36. The teacher assumes an apologetic tone when reacting to the student's ideas.
37. The teacher understands the student's ideas when they are in agreement with her own.
38. The teacher accepts all of the students comments in a distinterested fashion.
39. The teacher treats the student as an equal.
40. The teacher always follows the student's line of thought.
41. The teacher is pleased by the student's behavior.
42. The teacher looks down upon the student.
43. The teacher is never in any doubt about what the student means.
44. The teacher expresses great liking for the student.
45. The teacher frequently ridicules the student's ideas.
46. The teacher's own ideas completely interfere with his understanding of the student's.

47. The teacher is punitive toward the student.
48. The teacher is pleased when the student indicates approval of her ideas.
49. The teacher finds it difficult to think along the student's lines.
50. The teacher occasionally makes the student tense and on edge.
51. The teacher tries to please the student.
52. The teacher is able to permit the student's expression of ideas much of the time.
53. The teacher shows little hostility or liking for the student.
54. The teacher responds in neither a superior nor submissive manner toward the student.
55. The teacher is well able to understand the student's ideas.
56. The teacher responds warmly to the student's behavior.
57. The teacher frequently ignores the ideas and suggestions of the student.
58. The teacher's explanations fit in correctly with the student's ability and knowledge.
59. The teacher is greatly moved by the student's reactions.
60. The teacher gives an impression of "holier than thou."
61. The teacher reacts in terms of his own ideas.
62. The teacher is unpleasant to the student.
63. The teacher treats the students with much deference.
64. The teacher's comments tend to disrupt the student's trend of thought.
65. The teacher occasionally feels tense and on edge.
66. The teacher complies with the student's suggestions.
67. The teacher's explanations are understood to some extent.
68. The teacher maintains some distance between students and herself.
69. The teacher responds to the student's ideas in an accepting manner.

70. The teacher reacts in terms of relevant ideas.
71. The teacher is sympathetic about the student's problems.
72. The teacher generally directs the student's ideas.
73. The teacher's manner conveys the ability to accept controversial ideas.
74. The teacher greatly encourages and reassures the student.
75. The teacher ignores ideas coming from the student.

Addendum

The main thrust of this study was an investigation of the relationship between the teacher's levels of Empathy, Congruence, and Positive Regard and student achievement. The levels of the facilitative conditions were assessed from tape recordings of the teacher's actual classroom performance. Three experienced raters derived the levels according to the Truax Scales for Empathy, Congruence, and Positive Regard. The findings of that study indicate that the three teachers with the highest inferred self concepts also provided the highest levels of facilitative conditions. That is, there is a positive relationship between the teacher's inferred self concept and the levels of facilitative conditions she provides in the classroom, and in turn, both of these factors are positively and significantly related to student achievement.